EXTRACTS

FROM

THE CAPITAL

OF

KARL MARX.

Translated by Otto Weydemeyer.

PUBLISHED

BY

F. A. Sorge, Hoboken, New Jersey.

PRICE 20 CENTS.

A
20,113

750824

EXTRACTS

FROM THE

"CAPITAL" OF KARL MARX.

COMMODITY AND MONEY.

The wealth of those societies in which the capitalistic mode of production obtains, resembles an immense collection of goods; the single commodity appears as its rudimentary form.

Any thing, adapted to satisfy human desires of any kind, to be an object of consumption, constitutes a *value of use*. To become a commodity it must be possessed of another property—*value of exchange*.

The value of exchange is the quantitative proportion in which useful articles are equal to and therefore exchangeable with each other, as for instance, 20 yards linen = (are equal to) 1 cwt. iron. Different articles, however, are only proportionable quantities, as they are *equinominal* quantities, that is multiples or parts of the *same unity*, of something they have in *common*. Even so can in our example 20 yards linen only be equal to 1 cwt. iron in so far. as they represent something common to them both, of which precisely as much is contained in the 20 yards linen as in the 1 cwt. iron. This third property, which both have in common, is their *worth*, which each of the two articles possesses independent of the other. It follows therefore that the *value of exchange* of commodities is but the *mode of expressing their worth*, only the form that brings their worth to light and thus serves to effect their real exchange. We will hereafter return to this *form of worth*, but will now proceed to investigate its contents, the *value* of commodities.

Tho value of commodities, as expressed in their value of exchange, *consists* of nothing but the *labor* consumed in producing them or that is

contained in them. It is essential to understand precisely, in what sense labor is the only source of value.

In a primeval state of society one person alternately performs different kinds of work, as tilling the soil, weaving, forging, framing etc. However manifold the occupations, they are always but *different useful applications* of his nerves, muscle, hands etc., etc., in which this person expends *his own workingpower*. His labor always remains exercise of force—simply labor—while the useful form of this exercise, the kind of work, varies according to the intended result.

These different kinds of useful labor, performed by the same person consecutively, gradually diminish with social progress; they more and more change into distinct and contiguous vocations of different persons and groups of persons. But capitalistic society, in which the producer does not produce for his own but for foreign wants, for the market, in which his product is at once destined to assume the character of commodity and to be to him but an article of exchange,—capitalistic society is only possible, when production has developed to a many-membered system of different kinds of labor, carried on contemporaneously, to a ramified *social division of labor*.

What once held good for an individual, who alternately performed different kinds of work, is now true of society with its ramified division of labor: the utility of each particular species of labor is reflected in the particular value of use of its product, in the peculiar change of form by which it has made a certain natural material, subservient to a certain human desire. But the independent conduct of each of these immensely manifold kinds of useful labor does not alter the fact, that the one as the other is expenditure of human workingpower and only in this common quality of human exertion do they constitute commodity-*value*. The value of commodities means no more, than that the production of these things has cost expenditure of human workingpower, moreover *social* workingpower, since with developed division of labor, each individual workingpower only counts as a component part of the social workingpower. Each amount of individual labor—when taken as exertion of power—forthwith counts as a larger or a smaller amount of social *average labor*, i. e. of average exertion of social workingpower. The more average labor is contained in a commodity, the greater is its value.

Were the average labor, necessary for the production of a commodity, to remain constant, its value would also remain unchanged. But this is not the case, since the productive power of labor is determined by the average degree of skill of laborers, by the state of development of science and its technical adaptability, by the social combinations of the process of production, by the extent and efficacy of the means of production and by natural relations, and can consequently be very diversified. The greater the productive power of labor, the shorter the time requisite to the production of an article; the smaller the quantity of labor embodied in the latter, the smaller its value. And reversed, the less the productive power of labor, the more time is necessary to produce

an article, and the greater is its value. It is selfevident that this can only apply to a *socially normal* productive power and to the proportionate socially necessary time of labor. As for instance, the handweaver needs more labor than the machinery-weaver to render a certain number of yards. He does not, however, produce more value, as soon as weaving by machines is generally introduced; but all the labor that is used in weaving by hand, over and above that necessary to manufacture the same quantity of goods by machine-weaving, is *wasted* workingpower and consequently produces no value.

Things that have not resulted from labor, as for instance air, uncultivated timber, virgin soil etc. may have value of use, but they have no *value of exchange*. On the other hand things produced by human labor, do not become commodities, while they only serve to satisfy the wants of their immediate producer. To become a commodity an article must satisfy foreign wants, must have *social* value of use.

Returning to the *value of exchange*, that is to the form in which the *value* of commodities is expressed, we find that this form of value developes out of and with the exchange of produce.

So long as production is intended exclusively for self consumption, exchange is a rare occurrence and only takes place with one thing or another, of which the barterers just happen to have a redundancy. So will f.i * furs be exchanged for salt and that in quite casual proportions. With the frequent repetition of the barter the proportions of the exchange become more defined, so that a fur will only be exchangeable for a certain quantity of salt. In this primeval state of produce exchange the article of the other will be to each of the traders an equivalent, that is, an *article of value*, which is not only exchangeable for the one produced by himself, but wich is also the mirror in which the value of his own article is reflected.

The next stage of trade we still find to day, f. i with the hunting tribes of Siberia and with some Indian tribes, who, so to say, only furnish one article of exchange, namely furs. All foreign goods with which they are supplied, such as knives, weapons, brandy, salt etc., are to them as many different equivalents of their own article The variety of expressions that the value of furs thus received, accustomed them to look upon it as separated from the value of use of the product, while on the other hand, the necessity of regarding the same value in a continually increasing number of equivalents, led to a fixed determination of its magnitude. The value of exchange of the furs has now taken a much more precise form than in the preceding period of casual exchange of produce, and these articles consequently in a much higher degree partake of the character of *commodity*.

Let us now consider this trade from the standpoint of the foreign owners of goods. Each of them must express the value of his article to the Siberian hunters, or Indians, in furs. The latter thus become the *general equivalent* which is not only immediately exchangeable for all the foreign goods, but which also serves as the *common expression of*

value of all of them and consequently as a *measure* of *value* and a *comparer of value*. In other words: the fur within this sphere of produce exchange becomes—*money*. In the same manner has now this, then another, commodity acted the part of money. With the generalisation of exchange of goods this role is assigned to gold and silver, that is to a species of goods that are naturally best adapted for this function. They become the general equivalent, immediately exchangeable for all other commodities and in which these can all express, measure and compare their value. The value of a commodity expressed in money, is its *price*. The greatness of the value of 20 yds. linen f. i. is expressed in $10, if 20 yds. linen is equal to ½ ounce of gold and if $10 is the money name for ½ ounce of gold.

As any other commodity, money can only express its own magnitude of value in *other* commodities. Its own value is determined by the *time of labor* necessary to produce it and is expressed in that quantity of any other commodity, in which the same time of labor is embodied. One need only read the single items of a price current backwards to find the magnitude of the value of money expressed in every conceivable commodity.

By means of money the produce exchange is divided into two different transactions which complete each other The commodity, its value being expressed in its price, will be converted into money and from its money-form it is reconverted into another shape, into a commodity of the same price, for consumption. But as far as the transacting persons are concerned, the owner of a commodity first disposes of his commodity to a possessor of money, he sells, and then he exchanges the money received for articles of another possessor of goods, he purchases. It is *selling in order in purchase*. The total movement of commodities is known as—*circulation of commodities*.

At the first glance it appears as though the quantity of money circulating during one period of time, was solely determined by the entire amount of the prices of the merchandise being sold; yet this is not the case. If for instance 3 lbs. butter, 1 bible, 1 bottle of brandy and 1 ancient coin are simultaneously disposed of from four different venders to four different purchasers for $1 each, then it will require $4 to complete the transactions of the 4 sales. But if the one sells his butter and carries the acquired $1 to the bookseller who purchases brandy with it, and if the distiller procures an ancient coin with this $1, then, to accomplish the circulation of goods which together have a price of $4, but $1 is necessary. It is the same on a small as on a large scale. Therefore the quantity of circulating money is determined by the sum of prices of the commodities sold, devided by the number of circulations performed by the same money.

To simplify the process of circulation certain particles of weight of the article recognized as money are named and stamped with a standard character, i. e. *coined*.

Since gold and silver coins wear and grow lighter by often telling

over, they are partly replaced by metals of less value. The smallest fractions of the lowest gold coin is represented by pieces of copper or nickel. Articles almost worthless are also stamped into money. f. i., scraps of paper in a symbolic (imaginary) way represent certain quantities of gold or silver. This is the case with government legal tender notes.

Taking money out of circulation and retaining it, is hoarding it. Whoever sells merchandise without re-purchasing any is a money-hoarder. Among nations with undeveloped industry, as the Chinese, money-hoarding is as frequent as it is silly; gold and silver is *buried*.

But treasuring money is also necessary in societies with capitalistic production. Since quantity, price and rapidity of circulation of the commodities making the circuit in trade, constantly change, it requires sometimes more, sometimes less money to effect their circulation. Reservoirs are therefore required into which money retires from circulation and from which, according to the demand it again enters on its career. The most developed form of these channels for the in and out flow of money, or treasuries, are banks. The necessity of these institutions is the more evident, the less, in the developed civic (bourgeois) society, the circulation of commodities: Commodity—money—commodity, is carried on in a tangible form, regarding money. Leaving out of consideration the retail trade, money only acts as functionary of calculation and finally as means of payment. Buyers and sellers become debtors and creditors. The relations of indebtedness are determined by certificates, with which the various parties, effecting the circulation of commodities, who are now purchasers, then sellers, balance the mutual indebtedness. Only the differences are from time to time paid in real money. If this process is clogged, it is termed a *money crisis*, which makes itself known by the fact, that everybody demands *real* money and rejects the ideal.

The money reservoirs are of especial importance to the foreign trade, to the world market, because the money of the world generally appears in shape of gold and silver bars.

* f i.=For instance.

CAPITAL AND LABOR.

How then is money converted into capital?

Capital is only possible in a society, which produces commodities, in which circulation of commodities takes place, that *trades*. These are the historical perquisites to generating capital. The modern history of capital begins with the creation of the modern world-commerce and world-marked in the 16th century.

Historically, capital, (contrasted to real estate landed property), everywhere makes its first appearance in the shape of money, *money-*

property, merchant's capital and usurers-capital. The difference between money as such and money as capital can at first only be found in their different modes of circulation. For, besides the direct form of commodity—circulation, to sell in order to buy, (commodity - money—commodity), another form of circulation appears: to buy in order to sell, (money—commodity - money). Here we already see money acting as capital. While in the simple process of commodity-circulation, commodity is exchanged for commodity by the *mediation of money*; in the money-circulation, money is exchanged for money by the *mediation of commodity*.

It would be quite an absurd proceeding to exchange money for the *same amount* of money in this manner, f. i., $100 for $100; it would be much more rational to keep the $100 in the beginning. Such an aimless exchange, however, is never intended, but money is exchanged for *more* money, purchases are made to sell *dearer*.

In simple commodity circulation the commodity that enters it first, as well as the one that appears last, falls out of circulation, and will be consumed; but if money is at the two poles of circulation, the money which appears last can always repeat the same movement; it remains capital only as long as it does this. Only that possessor of money who circulates his money in this wise is a capitalist.

The value of use, then, is never to be considered the *immediate* aim of the capitalist, nor is it the *single* gain, but only the incessant movement of gaining. This absolute desire for riches, the passionate chase after the value of exchange is common to the capitalist and the money hoarder, but while the money hoarder is but the crazy capitalist, the capitalist is the prudent moneyhoarder.

The tendency to purchase in order to sell dearer, is most apparent in commercial capital, but the industrial capital is endowed with quite the same tendency.

It is commonly accepted that the surplus value is created thereby, that the capitalists sell their merchandise above its real value. But the same capitalists who sell must also purchase, and would in consequence also be obliged to pay more than the true value for merchandise; so that, if the foregoing postulate were true, the *class* of capitalists would never achieve their aim. If, however, we leave the class out of consideration, and only consider the individual capitalist, we find the following: One capitalist may exchange, f. i. $40 worth of wine for $50 worth of corn, gaining $10 by the transaction, but the sum of value of these two commodities remains $90 as before and is but differently distributed. Had the one directly pilfered $10 from the other, the state of affairs would be the same. "*War is robbery*," says Benjamin Franklin, "*trade is swindle*." Surplus value is not created in this manner. Nor does the usurer, who directly exchanges money for *more* money, produce surplus value; he only draws *existing* value from other purses into his own. May the individual capitalists swindle each other to their hearts content; selling and purchasing alone creates no surplus value. This is pro

duced outside of the sphere of circulation within which it is but realized, converted into money

Money *generates* not, and commodities do not multiply, though they change hands ever so often. Then something must happen to the commodity, after it is bought and before it is sold again, that enhances its value; it must be *consumed* in the intermediate station

To extract value of exchange from the consumption of a commodity, the possessor of money should have to find a commodity in the market possessed of the wonderful quality to transform itself into value during its consumption, and the consumption of which would consequently be creation of value. And, indeed, the money owner does find such a commodity in the market, namely, *working power*.

By workingpower, or working-ability, we comprehend all physical and mental faculties existing in man, and which he puts in motion whenever he produces value of use of any kind

In order to offer his workingpower for sale as a commodity, man must above all be able to dispose of it; he must be a free person, and to remain such he must only sell it for a certain time. Should he sell it once for all, he would from a free man become a slave, from the owner of a commodity he would himself become a commodity.

A free man is compelled to fetch his own working power to market, as soon as he is unable to sell other commodities, in which his working power is already contained. If anybody wants to embody his labor in a commodity he must possess the means of production, (rawmaterial, utensils, etc.) and also the necessaries of life, to sustain him until his commodity is sold. Devoid of these things it is utterly impossible for him to produce, and he can sell nothing but his own working power.

For the conversion of money into capital, the possessor of money must then find on the market of commodities the *free laborer*, free in the double sense: *free* to dispose of his working power as a commodity, having, on the other hand, no other commodity for sale, and *free* from all incumberance of things necessary to ply his workingpower. In other words, the laborer must not be a slave, but he must also have no possessions except his workingpower, must be a penniless fellow, if the possessor of money shall find him forced to sell his workingpower.

This relation certainly has no foundation in the laws of nature, since the earth does not create on the one side, possessors of money and commodities, and on the other side, possessors only of workingpower. Historical evolution and quite a series of economical and social revolutions have produced this relation.

The commodity workingpower has a value, which, like that of all other commodities is determined by the time of labor necessary to its production; in this case also reproduction. The value of the working power is therefore equal to the value of the necessaries of life, requisite to the maintenance of its owner. By maintenance, *permanent* maintenance, which includes propagation, must be understood. Thus the *value*

of exchange of the workingpower is determined; its *value of use* appears only during its consumption.

The consumption of workingpower, like that of any other commodity, takes place *outside* of the sphere of circulation of commodities, wherefore we must leave the latter to follow the money-owner and the possessor of workingpower to the *seat of production*. There it will not only be shown how capital produces, but also *how capital is produced*.

Until now we have but witnessed the association of free persons, peers, who dispose of their own at pleasure, who purchase and sell. But now, as we leave these scenes and accompany the acting persons to the seat of production, we notice a remarkable change in their physiognomies. *The former possessor of money takes the lead as capitalist, the possessor of working power follows as his laborer: the one smirking significantly and intent on business, the other shy and skulking, not unlike one who has carried his skin to market and has nothing else to expect—but*—BEING TANNED.

THE FOUNDATION OF THE CAPITALISTIC MODE OF PRODUCTION

Consumption of working power is labor. The purchaser of working power consumes the same by making its seller toil.

The process of labor is the transformation of the products of nature by man to suit his purposes. The products of nature are found in their original state. All things detached from earth's body by man, (as ore broken from the vein) are natural objects of labor; but things which have already been subjected to human labor, and which are still to be transformed (as ore broken from the vein and to be molten), are termed *raw material*.

Means of production are such things, which man plies in working at objects of labor. Such means of production may be the pure product of nature or may already contain human labor; the earth itself remains the *universal means of production*.

The result of the laboring process is the *product*; this emanates from the laboring process in various forms. Products may serve only for consumption, or only as means of production, or may only be useful as raw material (half manufacture) that requires more labor, or they may serve in different ways, as, f.i. grape as means of consumption and as raw material for wine. When products are used to create other products with, they become means of production.

Now that we have given these general explanations let us return to the *capitalistic* process of production.

After having purchased the means of production and working power, the possessor of money lets the latter consume the former, i. e., transform into products. The laborer consumes, as it were, the means of production by altering their form. The results of this process is the

altered means of production, into which, during their transformation new labor has percolated.

But these transformed things, these products, do not belong to the laborer producing them, they belong to the capitalist. For he has not only bought the means of production, but also the working power, and has, by bringing them in contact, caused their fermentation, so to say. The laborer here only plays the part of an automatic means of production.

The capitalist does not manufacture articles for his own private use, but for the market, therefore *commodities*. But that alone does by no means satisfy him. His aim is to manufacture commodities of *higher* value, than that of the necessary means of production and working power together; in short he wants a *surplus value*.

The attainment of surplus value is really the *only* motive, that incites the money owner to convert his money into capital, and to produce. Let us see how this craving is satisfied.

As shown before, the value of every commodity is determined by the average time of labor socially necessary for its production and therefore we have to resolve (analyze) the commodity produced by the capitalist into the working time embodied therein.

Say the raw-material requisite to the manufacture of an article costs $3 and that $1's worth of the means of production is consumed; say further these $4 represent the product of value of 2 working days of 12 hours each, then we shall find that the produced article in the first place embodies 2 workingdays. Rawmaterial and means of production, however, do not become commodity of themselves, but only through the application of labor; it is essential therefore to find, how much *time of labor;* that process of production requires. Suppose it lasts but 6 hours and that also 6 hours would be all that was required to replace the value of the working-power spent. The day's value of the working-power is determined by the value of the merchandise, necessary for its maintenance, or rather reproduction; it follows, that, if this value costs 6 working hours, then will the day's value of the working-power be replaced in 6 working hours and is expressed, according to the case supposed in a price of $1.—The finished product, therefore, contains 2½ workingdays or its total price is $5; but the capitalist has paid $5 for it himself, $4 for rawmaterial and means of production, $1 for working-power. It is plain that in such a case no surplus value can accrue. This, however, is not to the capitalist's taste; he wants surplus value, or else he "won't play." Rawmaterial is implacable, as are also the means of production They contain so and so much time of labor and have their certain value which the capitalist must pay, but they do not increase. There still remains the purchased working-power. The capitalist perceives that the laborer uses so many necessaries of life, as can be produced in six working-hours, that is $1 worth of goods; and he therefore pays him for his daily working-power $1. But he does *not* see why the so purchased workingpower should also be employed only 6 hours daily; no, he de-

mands that it should be employed for 12 *hours* daily, *i. e.* for a length of time, which in our case produces a value of $2. The problem is solved. We have seen that in 6 hours $3 worth of rawmaterial and $1 worth of means of production were transformed by the working-power, which also cost $1, into a product worth $5 or, in other words 2½ working days. Without expending more than $1 for the working-power our crafty capitalist makes the same operate not 6, but 12 hours, lets it consume in this time not for $3, but for $6 rawmaterial, and not means of production for $1, but for $2, and in this wise he obtains a product which embodies 5 working days and is therefore worth $10. But he has only expended: $6 for raw-material, $2 for means of production and $1 for working-power, aggregating $9. The finished product therefore contains a *surplus value* of $1.

It is evident that surplus value can only be gained by plying the working-power in a higher degree, than the replacing of its own value requires. Plainer: Surplus value arises from *unpaid* labor.

To ascertain the *degree*, in which working-power produces surplus value, we must divide the capital employed in production into two parts, one of which is invested in rawmaterial and means of production and the other in working-power. If for instance, $5,000 are expended for production, so that $4,100 are invested in rawmaterial and means of production and $900 in working-power, and if the value of manufactured merchandise is $5,900, it would seem as though a surplus value of 18 per cent. had been produced, provided one imagines that the surplus value resulted from the *whole* capital invested. But the value of $4,100 worth of rawmaterial and means of production has not changed; they have but changed their form; the working-power, however, for which $900 were paid, has during the consumption of the rawmaterial and means of production enhanced their value by $1,800, consequently it has produced a surplus value of $900. The capitalist has therefore gained from the working-power a surplus value of 100 per cent, for it has replaced its cost of production *twofold*, and only received the same once; for one half of the working-time it operated for nothing.

The capitalists and their savans may turn and twist themselves as much as they like, may palaver about the surplus value as a reward for their abstention (from consuming their property instead of investing it in enterprises), about risks, etc., etc. It is in vain. Working-material and means of production remain what they are and produce no new value by themselves; *it is the working-power and the working-power only*, which can produce surplus value.

THE WORKINGDAY.

Under equal conditions of production, the *necessary working time* the workman requires in order to reproduce the value paid him by the capitalist, that is, the price of his working-power, is limited by this same value. It would amount to 6 hours, if the production of the

average daily necessaries of life of a workingman required 6 hours. Accordingly, as the *overwork*, which yields the surplus value to the capitalists, lasts 4, 6 or more hours, the whole workingday will count 10, 12 or more hours. The more overwork, the longer, under these circumstances the workingday.

Overwork, as well as a workingday, can only be protracted to a certain length. As a horse f. i. can only work 8 hours daily on an average, so can man only labor a certain length of time daily. We must not only consider the physical, but also the moral conditions involved; not only, how much time does man need for sleeping, eating, washing, etc., but also what mental and social desires has he to satisfy, all of which is determined by the general state of civilization of a society. Nevertheless these boundaries of the workingday are so elastic, that we find contemporaneous workingdays of various duration, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 and even more hours.

Ofcourse a workingday must be shorter than 24 hours, but *how much?* The capitalist has peculiar views regarding this subject. As capitalist he is but capital personified. His soul is the soul of capital. But capital has but one motor of life: to fructify itself, to create surplus value, to imbibe, with its constant part, the means of production, the greatest possible quantity of overwork. Capital is deceased labor, that vampire-like lives by consuming live labor and lives the more, the more labor it devours. The capitalist buys the workingpower like a commodity, and like every other purchaser, he endeavors to make the most of its value of use; uses it to his own best advantage. But the possessor of the workingpower, the laborer, will also have his say; he therefore addresses the capitalist as follows:

"The article I sold you—my own workingpower—differs from the other crowd of goods in this, that *its consumption creates value*, and *greater value* than its own cost. For *this* reason you bought it. What appears on your side as a profitable investment of capital, is on my side a surplus expenditure of workingpower. You and I, we both know on the market but one law, that of exchange, and the use (consumption) of the article does not belong to the seller offering it, but to the purchaser acquiring it. The use of my daily power of work therefore belongs to you; but by means of its daily selling price, I must be able to reproduce it daily, and so to sell it anew. Without regard to the natural process of wearing out by age, etc., I must be capable of working to-morrow in the same normal state of strength, health and freshness as to-day. You constantly hold forth to use the gospel of economy and abstinence. Very well. Like a rational, prudent husbandman, I shall "economise" *my only wealth, my workingpower*, and I shall "abstain" from foolishly squandering it. I shall turn to use, put in motion, convert into labor only so much of it daily, as is compatible with its normal durability and healthy development. By an excessive prolongation of the working-day, you can consume a greater portion of my workingpower in *one* day, than I can restore in *three*

days. Thus your gain in labor is my loss in labor-substance. The *using* of my workingpower and the *robbing* of it are two entirely different things. If the average period an average workingman may live, with a rational limitation of work, be 30 years, the value of my workingpower, you pay me from day to day, is $^1/_{365} \times 30$ or $^1/_{10950}$'th of its total value. But if you consume it in 10 years, you pay me only $^1/_3$ of its value daily, and you *defraud* me daily of $^2/_3$ of its value. You pay me *one* day's work, when and while using *three* day's amount. That is against our agreement and against the law of exchange. Therefore, I demand a working day of *normal* length, and I demand it without appealing to your feelings, because money matters are not matters of affection, and business is soulless You may be a model citizen, perhaps a member of the society for the prevention of cruelty to animals, you may even have the scent of sanctity and piety, but no heart beats in the bosom of the *thing* you represent toward me. What seems to be pulsating therein is my own hearts, beat. I demand the *normal workingday*, because I demand the value of my commodity like every other dealer."

Capitalist and laborer, as we see, both refer to the law of commodity-exchange; nothing but force can decide between their antagonistic claims of right. And thus, in the history of capitalistic production, the desire to regulate the workingday assumes the shape of a struggle *for the limits* of the workingday—a struggle between the collective capitalist, i. e the *class* of capitalists and the collective workingman, or the working-*class*.

The reports of the English factory inspectors prove, that no means are too small or too bad for the manufacturer to evade or violate the laws, that regulate the time of labor. Voraciously they devour every minute, they can catch, so that the inspectors accuse them of "minute-stealing" The reports from the time previous to the existence of a normal workingday, or of business branches in which it does not yet exist, are utterly revolting. The sanitary commissioners generally expressed it as their opinion, that universal mental and physical crippling must ensue, unless the nefarious exploitation by capital were restricted by strong barriers.

A workingday of 24 hours, were it feasible, would be the hearts delight of the capitalist. The much favored *day and night relay system* gives ample proof thereof. Capital does not care how long the working-power lasts; it is only interested in the greatest quantity of workingpower available in one day. Although it certainly has a foreboding, that its homicidal conduct must lead to a terrible end, it thinks that this end will not approach so soon In every stock-swindling operation every one knows, that the crash must once come, but every one hopes it may alight on his neighbor, after he has reaped and secured the golden rain to himself. Capital is, therefore, entirely regardless of the health or the vitality of the laborer, unless it is *forced* to some consideration by society.

From the middle of the 14th to the end of the 17th century the work-

ingday of the laborers of England was *prolonged* by legislation; society is now at least as much justified to *shorten* the workingday.

The condition of the workingtime previous to the epoch of the great industry, may be seen from the complaints made even towards the end of the last century, that many laborers only worked 4 days in a week. A zealous pioneer of capitalistic tyranny proposed in the year 1770, to erect a workhouse for all those who were dependent on public benevolence, a house of terror, in which 12 hours daily work should be required. Then, an institution should be made a *house of terror* by a workingday of 12 hours, while 63 years later, the time of labor in 4 branches of work was *reduced* by the power of the State 12 hours for children between the ages of 13 and 18, thereby creating quite a storm of indignation among the capitalists.

The struggle for reduction of the hours of labor was carried on by the laborers of England with perseverance since 1802. For 30 years they almost fought in vain, though they carried 5 factory laws, but these laws had no clause to secure their enforcement, Only since 1833 a normal workingday was gradually introduced.

The labor of children and of young persons to the age of 18 was the first to be restricted. The manufacturers raged at the introduction of the respective laws, and when that was of no avail, they concocted complete systems to evade these laws.

Since 1838 the cry of the factory-laborers for a normal workingday of 10 hours continually became louder and more universal. In 1844 the workingtime of females *above* 18 years was also restricted to 12 hours and nightwork for them was prohibited. Simultaneously the workingtime of children under 13 years was reduced to $6\frac{1}{2}-7$ hours. Precautions were also taken to prevent the evasion of the law as much as possible and it was stipulated that neither women nor children should take their meals in the workshops.

The consequence of the restriction of women and children labor was, that labor in *general* was cut down to 12 hours in those factories that were subjected to the enforcement act The factory act of July 8th, 1847, stipulated, that the workingday for persons from 13—18 years of age and for all females should be reduced to 11 hours at once, and to 10 hours from May 11th, 1848.

This was more than the capitalists would brook, and they revolted against it. As reduction of wages etc., would not entice the laborers to clamor against the "restriction of their liberty;" as all imaginable tricks, to frustrate control, proved futile, the law was openly violated. Courts, consisting of capitalists themselves, frequently acquitted their brother capitalists, despite the most flagrant violation of the law. Finally even one of the four highest courts declared the words of the law to be senseless.

The laborers lost their patience at last and assumed such a threatening demeanor, that the capitalists were forced to a compromise, which

received legal power by the factory-act-amendment of Aug. 5th 1850, and did away with the relay-system entirely.

From that time law gradually regulated the workingday, although large bodies of laborers were still exempt from this legislation.

While in England, the cradle of the capitalistic mode of production, the normal workingday was conquered, step by step, despite the most furious opposition of the capitalists, by the admirable perseverance of the laborers, everything was quiet in France, until the revolution of February 1848 gave *all* workingmen a normal workingday of 12 hours, *at one stroke.*

In the United States, the struggle for a normal workingday, only commenced after the abolishment of slavery. The National Labor Convention in Baltimore, August 16th, 1866, demanded a normal workingday of 8 hours, and since then, an unceasing agitation has begun with growing success.*)

In the same year the Congress of the International Workingmen's Association also proclaimed the demand of a normal workingday of 8 hours.

In short: The laborers of all civilized countries have come to the conclusion that *first of all* they must have a normal workingday. They are of the same opinion as the factory inspector, *Saunders*, who said: "Further proceedings towards the reformation of society will never be effected with any chance of success, unless the workingday is restricted and its prescribed limit is rigidly enforced,"

As a socialistic form of society postulates a higher standard of life of the workingmen, it can not reduce the workingday to the time, requisite to the production of the necessaries of life But then the producers would work only for themselves and not for capitalists, landowners and aristocratic idlers, and the workingday would be much shorter, than in the present society, since every one would work who is able, since the waste of forces, unavoidable in capitalistic society, would cease, and because, with a thorough education of the laborer, the producing power of social labor would assume proportions hardly conceivable now.

DIVISION OF LABOR.

If the full value of the workingpower is paid and nothing is clipped off, as the capitalists are wont to do whenever opportunity offers, there remains the *length of the workingday given*, over and above the time neces-

* Note of the translator:
In 1831 the agitation for less hours began in the United States.
Under the administration of President Martin Van Buren (1836—1840) labor in the Government works was restricted to ten (10) hours.
The agitation for a reduction of the hours of labor reached the Legislature of Massachusetts in 1845.
The Caulkers and Ship Joiners obtained the Eight Hours already in 1860.

sary to reproduce this value, only a fixed number of hours, in which surplus value can be produced. To increase the surplus labor, and consequently the surplus value under these circumstances, the time necessary to the maintenance of the workingpower must be *reduced*. This can only be done by increasing the productiveness of labor, by enabling the laborer to create the same amount of necessaries of life in less time.

In those branches of business in which the necessaries of life, or the means to produce them, are created, the enhanced productiveness of labor does not only decrease the value of the goods produced, but also the value of the workingpower, since the latter is regulated by the former. In all other business branches the price of workingpower will fall, at least relatively, that is, compared to the price of the commodity which it produces, and this will continue until competition has by and by, reduced the commodities to their new and, (by the augmented productiveness of labor) diminished value. It is therefore the irresistible desire, and constant tendency of capital, to increase the productive power of labor, in order to cheapen the merchandize, and *by the cheapening of merchandize to cheapen the labore* .

(To prevent misunderstanding it may be stated that we must not here cling to the money expression. At present almost every commodity is cheaper than ever, especially the commodity, workingpower, but the price of commodities expressed in money *appears* higher than ever. It *appears!* for it is but appearance, since the value of money is also considerably depreciated)

The design in developing the productive power of labor within the capitalistic production is to *decrease that part* of the workingday, in which the laborer works for himself, and just thereby to *increase the other part* of the workingday, in which he works for the capitalist *without remuneration*.

We will now contemplate the *separate methods of production* by which this result is achieved.

One of these methods of production is *co-operation*. This method pre-supposes the concentration of more or less capital in the hands of industrial employers and it develops itself from the employment of many wages-laborers by one master.

The productive power of these co-workers is increased by the local concentration and by the contemporary activity of their individual powers, and the means of production become cheaper. (For example: One workshop for 100 laborers costs much less than 50 workshops for 2 laborers each. The same rule applies to warehouses and other localities, as also to the various implements.)

Co-operation assigns to the capitalist the part of a *manager*, which in his hands assumes a *despotic* character, which becomes the more conspicuous, as the area of the co-operation *increases*

From simple co-operation emanates *the division of labor within the workshop*, which characterises the manufacturing period (previous to the industrial period of to-day) Either artizans of *different* profession were

united in one workshop, as wheelwrights, smiths, locksmiths, harness-makers painters etc., to produce *one* article, say a carriage - thereby transforming each of these manifold kinds of labor of different independent professions into a part of the labor belonging to carriage-manufacture only. Or, many artizans of the *same* trade, as needle makers, were employed in the same workshops and put to work at the same time and with one another, when it would soon come to pass, that a part of these laborers would only make a certain part of the product and work "hand in hand." This method has, in some branches of production, led to a great many divisions in labor and thereby greatly increased its productiveness.

Such division of labor does not only save very much time, that formerly was wasted with the changing from one part operation to another, but it enables the laborer to attain an almost incredulous dexterity and rapidity by the constant sameness of his work.

This method of production also causes the replacing of such tools as were commonly plied in a trade by tools only adapted for particular operations, which are therefore much more useful and make work easier, thereby increasing its productivity. The material perquisites for machinery, which is a combination of simple tools, were created in this manner.

In manufacture, the different component parts of a commodity are made by just as many different kinds of laborers. But every part does not require the same amount of labor; more laborers must be employed in the manufacture of one part than in that of the other. The more laborers are combined in one business, the more precise can the real proportion in this respect be reached. This is one of the many reasons for the greatest possible concentration of capital.

Some simple machines, especially for such operations as require great exertion of force, are already applied in the manufacturing epoch, as in paper manufacture, the trituration of rags in paper mills, but the specific machinery of the manufacturing epoch is the *collective laborer* composed of many part-laborers.

Some of the individual laborers have to develop more power, others more dexterity and still others more mental activity, capacities to which the individuals are expressly trained. But the collective laborer possesses *all* qualities necessary for the various part-labors and executes each of them by a member exclusively designated for it.

To train laborers for manufacture is less expensive than to train artizans, and thus, the value of workingpower in manufacture decreases, compared to that of artizans whilst the profit of capital increases.

For completeness sake the relations between manufactural and social division of labor may here be indicated. Regarding labor itself, the classification of production in species, as agriculture, industry etc., may be termed "division of labor in general"; the subdivisions of these species into various branches of business, "division of labor in particular";

and the division of labor within the workshop, "division of labor in detail." The foundations of all developed division of labor which is effected by produce exchange, is the *separation of city and country*.

A developed *social* division of labor is the necessary pre-requisite of a manufactural division of labor. On the other hand the social, division of labor is further developed by the manufactural.

The main difference between these two kinds of division of labor is, that each independent branch of business produces *commodities*, while the part laborers of manufacture produce *no* commodities; only the products of their *collective* labor become commodities, The manufactural division of labor pre-supposes the absolute *authority of the capitalist* over persons, who are but the members of the joint mechanism belonging to him. The social division of labor confronts independent producers of commodities, who acknowledge no other authority but that of competition, the constraint exercised upon them by the pressure of their mutual interests. It is highly characteristic that the most enthusiastic adherents of the factory system can accuse the general organization of social labor of nothing worse, but that such would transform the whole society into a factory.

Under the guild-laws, when the number of journeymen a master was allowed to employ, as well as the whole business of each of the guilds, was precisely stipulated, no manufactural division of labor could take place; this was rather a specific creation of the capitalistic method of production.

The more the manufactural division of labor is developed, the more *one-sided* must be the development of the working-power of the individual laborer, so that it really only becomes productive, when the capitalist has bought and placed it in its *proper* place. The individual laborer becomes incapable of producing anything and sinks down to an appurtenance of the workshop of the capitalist. As it was written on the forehead of the chosen people that they were Jehovah's property, so does the division of labor imprint on the manufactural laborer the stamp that brands him as the property of the capitalist. Furthermore does this method of working result in the mental and physical crippling of the laborers. The latter is evident in a series of trade-maladies; the former in general mental debility, lack of energy, yea, in total stupidity.

But manufacture, the technical foundation of which, however one-sided, remains artizan skill, furnishes the *machines*, by means of which the method of production is totally revolutionized and the *Great Industry* is created.

THE GREAT INDUSTRY.

While in manufacture the great changes in the process of production are wrought by the working-power, the evolution in the great in-

dustry is brought about by the means of production; machines take the place of tools for manual use.

All developed machinery consists of three distinctly separate parts: the motor, the transmitting mechanism and the working instruments. The motor supplies the motive power for the whole mechanism It either generates its own motive power, as the steam, caloric, electro-magnetic and other engines, or it receives the impetus from a natural power without, as the turbrue from water-pressure, the wing of a wind-mill from wind, etc. The transmitting mechanism is made up of fly-wheels, pulley, cogwheels, beltings and gearings of all kinds, it regulates the motion, changes its direction when necessary, as f. i. from the perpendicular to the circular, it distributes and transmits it to the working instruments. These two parts of the machinery are only there to impart the motion to the working instruments, by which the latter seize the object of work and transform it into the desired shape. It is this part of the machinery, the working instrument, that has wrought the industrial revolution of the 18th century. It is the daily source of industrial changes, whenever artizan labor or manufactural production is superseded by machine labor.

In that part of the machine. which we have called working instruments, we meet the tools of the handi-craftsman and manufactural laborer, with but this difference, that with the latter two the quantity and the extent of the tools is limited by the human organism, which is not the case with the working instruments. Even the oldest spinning machine operates from 12 to 18 spindles, the stocking knitting machine knits with thousands of needles at once, etc.

At first, machines were propelled by men, then frequently by horses, etc., more seldom by inconstant wind, but, more and more. water was brought into requisition as motive power. The appliance of water power, however, was connected with several disadvantages, which were only removed by the invention of the steam engine. The site of the factory was now no longer confined to the locality, to the existence of a living water-power. The degree of motive-power, which hitherto had depended on existing natural facilities, now became altogether subject to human regulation and the same motive engine could be applied to the most extensive transmitting mechanism and to the most numerous working-instruments.

Factories may be of two kinds. The one kind combines *many similar* working instruments, of which each manufactures the whole product; the other kind embraces a *system of different* machines, of which each manufactures *a part* of the product, so that the latter must go through the various machines before it is completed.

As a membered system of automatic working-machines to which the motion is imparted by the transmitting machine from a central automatic motor, the machine work has its developed form. In the place of the single machine stands a mechanical monster, whose body fills whole factory buildings and whose demoniac power, first concealed in the so-

lemn, regular motion of its giant members, breaks loose in the feverish. wild whirling of its innumerable, real working instruments.

At first the machines were made by artisans and manufactural laborers, but such production was soon found to be inadequate and machines were used to manufacture machines.

The change which the great industry wrought in the mode of production, gradually extended to the means of communication and transportation. Railroads, steamboats, telegraphs, etc, were established.

Capital acquires all discoveries and inventions, so to say for nothing. What the capitalist has had to employ for the exploitation of science is but a costly apparatus, which is, however, infinitely cheaper, than the quantity of machinery, etc., that would otherwise have been necessary to produce the same vast quantities of merchandize.

That part of its value which the machine loses by wearing is imparted to the product. But withal this part of the value is smaller in machine production than in the manual production of artizans, because it is distributed among a greater quantity of products, while at the same time the application of the means of production becomes more economical and these consist of more durable material.

The labor saved by the application of machinery must be greater than that required to make the latter, The productiveness of the machine is therefore measurable by the human labor it saves. An automatic spinning machine will spin as much yarn in 150 working hours (adding together the working time of all those employed at the machine) as can be spun in 27,000 working hours with a hand spinning wheel.

In as far as machinery makes muscular power dispensable, it becomes the means of employing *laborers of no muscular power* or of undeveloped bodies, but greater suppleness of limbs. *Women and children's* labor was therefore the first word of capitalistic application of machinery! The most powerful substitute of labor and laborers was therefore immediately turned to means to *increase the number of wages laborers* by enrolling all members of the laborer's *family*, without distinction of age or sex, under the immediate control of capital. The compulsory labor for the capitalist, did not only usurp the place of child's play, but also that of the free labor in the family circle, within the moral bounds of the family itself. The value of the working-power had been determined not only by the working time necessary to sustain the adult laborer individually, but by that time necessary to the maintenance of the *laborer's family*. By precipitating all members of the laborers family into the labor market, machinery distributes the value of the laborers working-power over his whole family It therefore *depreciates* his own working-power. Formerly the laborer sold his own working power, nominally disposing of it as a free man. He now sells *wife* and *child*—he becomes *slave-trader*.

The injury done by woman's labor is shown by the circumstance that of every 100,000 children *under one year* in the most salubrious districts of England 9000 die, and in the worst situated, that is, industrial dis-

tricts 24 000—26,000 die. The women can not nurse the children, and are compelled to give to them, instead of their breast, poor and injurious mixtures, and to produce artificial sleep they give, them anaesthetics

By dint of the overpowering addition of women and children to the body of workers, machinery ultimately breaks the resistance, which the male laborer had still offered to the despotism of capital in the manufactural epoch The laborers become more and more enslaved!

Machines do not only wear by use: elementary influences spoil them, when they are *not* used. Every improved machine depreciates, the less perfect one according to the extent and efficacy of the improvement. It is therefore the desire of the capitalist to use his machine up in the shortest possible time, that is, to carve as much working-time as possible out of each given space of time. Thereby he not only protects himself against loss but secures to himself considerable gain

The prolonged workday, whether it be prolonged directly or under the name of "overtime" has this advantage for the capitalist, that he can produce more merchandize and consequently more surplus value, *without* increasing that part of the capital invested in machinery and buildings.

So long as in a braneh of production machinery is only used by a few capitalists, these have a monopoly and ofcourse they 'do an excellent business;" but as soon as machine work becomes general, the magnitude of the surplus value depends only on the number of laborers employed at the same time and on the degree of their exploitation. Therefore the burning desire of capital to prolong the workingday.

While thus the capitalistic application of machinery on the one hand stretches the workingday, and presses into the service of production a vast amount of new working-power, (women and children), and on the other hand continually makes laborers "superfluous,' it creates a so-called *over*-population, whose competition depresses the price of working-power.

Thus machinery, which enables the laborer to produce *more* in *less* time, in the hands of capital became the means of *unmeasured prolongation* of the workingday. But as soon as society, whose very source of life was thus threatened, legally fixed a normal workingday, capital endeavored to exploit the working-power as *intensely* as possible, i. e. to compel the laborer to be as active during the shorter working-time, as he could not possibly be during a longer stretch of time.

How is this accomplished? By various methods supported by certain modes of paying—as paying for piecework.

After a reduction of the working-time, a general increase of the working capacity was noticeable with the manufactural laborers of England. In those factories, where the activity of laborers is regulated by machinery, it was at first held, that a decrease in the working-time could not possibly increase the strain on the workingpower, but the result proved this to be a fallacy. In a shortened workingday, partly the

speed of machinery is increased, and partly the single laborer is assigned a larger scope of duty, both of which require improvment and alteration of machinery.

(Marx proves by statistical dates, that, since the legal shortening of the working-day in England the working-power of the individual laborer was strained to such an extent, that after the lapse of a few years the number of laborers employed greatly *receded* in comparison to the immense increase and extent of factories. Much more labor was therefore extorted from each laborer, than ever before, yea, this extortion by and by became so insolent and oppressive, that the laborers saw their only means of escape, from being worn out too quickly was in a renewed reduction of the working time, and now they have already conquered a workingday of 9 and 8 hours here and there.)

RESULTS OF THE DEVELOPED FACTORY SYSTEM.

While in the manufactural period we find quite a scale of laborers with different grades of skill, all such inequalities vanish in the factory; there, in general, we find but average laborers, solely differing from each other in age and sex, wherefore their wages are determined by the degree of muscular power and not by the skill they command.

The factory employs principally two kinds of laborers, such as are really tending the machines (engine-tenders etc. also come under this head), and helpers (mostly children) who feed the machines with the raw material. Besides these two principal classes there are yet those who control and repair the machines, as engineers, machinists etc.

If in the manufactural period the laborer was doomed to *use* a tool his life long, the factory now condemns him to *serve* a machine for life. Machinery is mis-used to convert the laborer from childhood on into a part of a machine. The cost of production of the workingpower is decreased, in consequence also its price and the dependence of the laborer from the capitalist reaches its acme. By their conversion into an automaton, the means of production (machines etc.) confront the laborer during the process of labor as capital, inanimate labor, which governs and drains the living workingpower.

Manual and mental labor in the factory are entirely separated; there are manual laborers and overseers .A *military discipline*, a *despotic regime*, obtains here. The capitalist *rules supreme* like an absolute monarch; the various officers (directors, foremen etc.) *command* and the privates, the laborers, must *obey* in silence. *In lieu of the cow-hide of the slave driver there is the book of penalties of the overseer.* Of course all penalties consist of fines and deductions of wages, and the legislative ingenuity of the factory Lycurgus's has almost made the violation of their laws more profitable to them than their observance.

But these are not the only evil features of the factory, for it injures the laborer in a great many ways. The high temperature, the noise, the dust, seriously affect all senses, not to mention the continual danger of life that surrounds the laborer and which finds its illustration year by year in innumerable "accidents." Under such circumstances capitalistic production becomes the means, not only of the exploitation, but of *a systematic robbery of the very conditions of life of the laborer* during his labor, as of space, air, light and personal safeguards against the life and health endangering institutions of the factory, not to mention appliances for the convenience of laborers. Is Fourier wrong in calling factories, "moderate penitentiaries"?

And what miseries are in store for the laborers, whenever in a new branch of trade the mechanical or manufactural mode of production is superseded by production in factories? Either such a transition is slow, and mechanics try to compete with factory labor, or it is rapid and suddenly throws a host of laborers on the street. In the first case, a whole class of laborers for decades contends against starvation, as the English hand cotton weavers in the beginning of this century (the hand weavers of Saxony, Silesia and Bohemia, the shoemakers of the U. S. etc.) are just now enacting a similar harrowing drama; in the second case thousands often immediately perish of famine. Thus the governor of East India where the industrial cotton weaving of England had suddenly crowded out the East India handweaving, wrote, 1834—35: "*The misery hardly finds a parallel in the whole history of commerce. The bones of the cottonweavers bleach the plains of India.*"

Every improvement of machinery throws a part of the laboring class out of work, or replaces men by women and these by children. Even for the sake of forestalling any resistance of the laborers and to tighten their bonds of slavery, capital is constantly bent on making their skill superfluous by new machines.

It is, therefore, not astonishing, that the laborers for a long time fanatically opposed the introduction of machinery, the prerequisite of the factory, and even destroyed them. (Their error was, in not perceiving how beneficial machines are to humanity, as such, and that the wrong is to be found in our perverse, ruling relations of property, which enable individuals to use such institutions for their own benefit exclusively.)

Because the factory system admits of great and sudden expansion, and because it is entirely dependent on the world-market, feverish production and overstocked markets alternate with general stoppage. The employment and situation of life of the laborers is therefore very inconstant.

Except in times of uncommonly good business, the capitalists are waging war with each other for the sake of the market, and they fight it out with the weapon of the greatest possible cheapness of commodties. If improvement of machinery etc. affords no chance to under-

bid, then, now-a-days the laborer must suffer, and the price of his workingpower will be depressed.

An immediate consequence of the introduction of machinery into any trade, is generally, the reduction of the number of laborers employed in this trade, while in other trades, which produce the raw material for this one, or which consume the product of this trade as rawmaterial, the number of laborers will increase

Besides the manufactural and factory labor, there is the so-called house-labor, a species of labor in which the wildest fleecing of workingmen is practised As these house-laborers are so scattered, they are much less capable of resistance than those laborers employed in manufacturies and factories. Moreover they generally work with obsolete tools and are subject to the exactions of middlemen, who crowd in between them and the capitalists

By the by, however, this house-labor must yield to manufacture and this again to factory labor. A compulsory normal working-day undermines it, since it can only compete with factory-labor, by the unlimited license to grind the laborer.

The factory laws have given birth to numerous inventions, which did not only permit of a sudden beginning and stopping of labor, as required by a normal workingday, but also cheapened the whole process of production. So in potteries, wallpaper, match and other factories.

A time is generally stipulated, at which such laws shall come into force and the manufacturers use the interval in directing their paid savans, the proletarians of science, to contrive new inventions, so that with the respective law or shortened workingday, institutions shall also come into practice at the same time, which will possibly be productive of more profit to the capitalists than the former system.

On an average the smaller capitalists can not keep up with the big ones in this respect and therefore they perish. The sequel is, constant concentration of capital.

It is but in consonance with the Shylock-like nature of capital, that it clamors against every new factory law and declares its introduction for so long an impossibility until it is enforced. And yet the factory legislation is but a natural product of capitalism, which could not continue without it.

We must, however, remember, that many of these laws can be easily evaded and are actually evaded in innumerable cases, that for the health of laborers and for the education of children very little has been done yet and that there is still a vast number of evils, which factory legislation does not touch. (The author principally refers to England, for in most other countries the laborer can be exploited almost without *any limit.*)

In the time of the guilds, people clung with the utmost tenacity to the established mode of creating the various commodities and shrank from any change. It is different, however, with the great industry, as this acknowledges no form of a process of production to be final, but is

rather constantly changing and revolutionizing all branches of production.

Not only are old machines constantly replaced by those of more modern construction, but the social division of labor is also suffering a continuous transformation.

When the generalisation of factory legislation as a physical and mental safeguard of the working class shall have become inevitable, it will generalise and hasten, as already intimated, the transformation of scattered labor processes of dwarfish dimensions into combined labor processes on a large scale, the concentration of capital and the factory-regime itself. It will destroy all ancient and transient forms, which yet partly conceal the rule of capital and will replace them by its direct and undisguised rule. *It will thereby also generalise the direct struggle against this rule!*

The transformation of agriculture by the great industry does not visit the physical injuries on the laborer, incidental to factory labor, but instead, it creates so much more "surplus" laborers, without providing other employment

In the sphere of agriculture the great industry is in so far the most revolutionary, as it destroys the bulwark of old society, the "peasant" and substitutes therefor the wages laborer. The contrast between the city and country will thus be adjusted and their requirements of social transformation be the same.

The more agriculture is carried on industrially, the more intense will not only the laborer but also the *soil*, be exploited. The capitalistic mode of production, therefore, only develops the technic and the combination of the social process of production, while it *undermines* at the same time the very sources of all wealth: the earth and the laborer.

———o———

WAGES.

The article which the capitalist receives from the laborer is a certain quantity of labor, for which he pays a certain amount of money, just as for certain quantities of any other article, for pounds of iron, yards of cloth, bushels of wheat, etc. The money which the laborer receives in payment, seems (as with all other articles) to replace the value or *price* of the article furnished, *i. e.*, the *value or price of labor*. This money is therefore called *wages*. If we consider how firmly notions, derived from daily recurring events, are impressed upon the human brain as self-evident truths, we can easily comprehend why capitalists and laborers, political economists and socialists, have never even put the question : Is there really such a thing as a value or price of labor, and therefore wages, which is but the money expression for that nominal value or price?

Our reader knows that wages are but the *appearance*, a perverted mode of expression for the equivalent which is paid for the *value or price*

of the working power, not of labor; that in fact the working power itself only has a value because it is also a product of labor, because its production and sustenance cost labor. We must admit, that all state attorneys, policemen and militia taken together have not done as much for upholding the present condition of society, as this form—*wages*.

As we have seen, the laborer is only allowed to work, therefore to live, if he performs *forced labor* for the capitalist; for, all labor that man must do for man without compensation, on penalty of starvation, death, or of being imprisoned for vagrancy, is naturally forced labor, and proves conclusively that this person is in a relation of bondage to some other person or persons or to a certain class of other persons, so that he is in fact a slave and not a free man. Let us now see how this real state of affairs is concealed by this wonted form of wages.

We resume our former example, wherein the laborer must work 12 hours daily, firstly 6 hours to earn his livelihood, *i. e.*, to replace the day's value of his working power paid him by the capitalist, to the amount of $1; secondly, 6 hours to give the capitalist a surplus value of $1. If this *day's value or day's price of his working power* of $1, be expressed as *value or price of his day's labor*, then $1 represents the *wages* of twelve hours' labor, and at that, wages which exactly correspond to this quantity of labor, not a cent more or less. Apparently the laborer has not rendered a minute's work without pay. Thus every vestige of his forced labor, and with it his relation of bondage is blotted out. Nor is this all. If labor, instead of being the creator of value, is itself but an article of value, it can, like every other means of production, give the product in the creation of which it is consumed, no more value, than it possesses itself, consequently in our case not more than the value of $1. The second dollar by which the product has increased, and which as surplus value wanders into the pockets of the capitalist, cannot with this assumption possibly have emanated from the twelve hours' work of the laborer, which is already requited to its full value of $1: it must proceed from another source, be it from mysterious self-fructification of capital, or from the herculean labor of the capitalist, and in this case it would be but another name for his own wages.

In socage the condition of affairs is apparent. For so and so many days the socager works for himself, and for so and so many days he must render statute labor. In slave labor even that part of the working time, in which the slave only reproduces the value of his own nesessities of life, seems to be unpaid. Here the property relation in which the slave is confined conceals his working for himself, while in wages labor the money relations hide the uncompensated work of the wages labor.

Since we have discovered the secret of the value or price of labor and therefore that of the wages, we can also state in this perverted terminology, the laws which govern the value or price of the working power.

The two main species of wages are *time wages* and *piece wages*. As labor is always only sold for a certain period of time, the wages will be

reckoned in the first place as day's wages or week's wages, etc. In piece wages, however, labor seems not to be paid according to its quantity, but in proportion to the product it yielded.

In order to arrive at a fair estimate of the so-called price of labor in true wages, the hour must be taken for a unity of measure, therefore the day's wages must be divided by the number of hours of a working day. Unless this is done the result cannot be correct. Suppose one laborer works 10 hours and another 12 hours daily, and each received $1, then their day's wages will be equal; not so, however, the price of their labor, for the one receives one-tenth of a dollar per hour, the other one-twelfth.

Where so-called hour's wages are customary the laborer may soon be placed in a sad predicameut, for the capitalist may demand that once an unusual number of hours is worked daily, and again that but very few hours are worked. The laborer will now be subject to overwork, and at other times may not earn enough wages to eke out a poor living.

If we have a working day of fixed length, and *overtime* is introduced besides, which is a very common practice, then will the total day's wages, *including the payment for overtime*, not be more but often less than the day's value of the working power.

The longer the working day (whether a part of it is reckoned as *overtime* or not) *the lower the wages*. The more *one* laborer produces the *fewer* laborers are required for the production of a certain quantity of goods, and the *proffer* of working power must *increase*, but its price must *fall*. In business branches in which the working day is *exceptionally* long, and the capitalist consequently makes an unusual profit, by the extension of the surplus labor, as well as by the curtailment of the normal wages—in such business branches the price of merchandise will gradually be depressed by competition. A return to shorter working time and higher wages is therefore opposed by the capitalists with double tenacity.

Piece wages are only another form of time wages, although it *appears* as though in this kind of wages the prices of labor were determined by the quantity of the product yielded. In fixing the piece wages the following questions arise: What is the duration of the customary working day? What quantity of goods does a laborer of average industriousness and ability make in this time? What are the daily wages under these circumstances?

Suppose we find out that on an average, 30 pieces of one commodity can be produced by a laborer in a working-day of 12 hours, for which he receives day's wages of $1 50, then the piece wages for one piece of this commodity will be 5 cents, for 30 pieces, $1 50. Therefore the laborer will derive no benefit from this form of wages, but the capitalist knows well how to take advantage of it.

While with time wages it is possible for a laborer sometimes to produce less goods than are required on an average, while then the laborer could sometimes - to use a capitalistic phrase—"cheat" the capitalist, he *must*, with piece wages, under all circumstances render a

certain quantity of goods for a certain amount of wages. It is the same in regard to quality of goods, it must be of a certain degree. Faults finding with the goods and deduction of wages are companions to piece wages, and are systematically practised as a fleecing by the capitalists. The capitalist can also save the expenses of supervision to a great extent.

In the house labor, before mentioned, piece wages are the rule, because they replace the supervision, which is here impossible

In workshops and factories the capitalist makes contracts on the basis of piece wages with so-called foremen (gang-leaders, etc.), who, with the aid of a number of other laborers produce a certain quantity of goods, for a given amount of wages, and of course impose as much as possible on their helpers. In this way the laborer is exploited by the laborer, and exploitation is made easy for the capitalist.

The piece worker, in order to increase his earnings, exerts his powers to the utmost, and endeavors to prolong the working time, which for the same reasons as with the time wages, finally results in *reductions of wages*. Under the rule of piece wages the laborer's gain by excessive work is sickness and premature death, and they are after all worse off than if they work more moderately for time wages. *The ignorance of the workingman regarding the laws of the capitalistic mode of production is the main cause for this.*

Although piece wages now and then occur in the fourteenth century, their more general application, however, takes place with the introduction of the great industry, which at the time of its advent used this system mainly as *a lever for the prolongation of the working time and for the reduction of wages.*

———o———

THE PROCESS OF CONSERVATION AND ACCUMULATION OF CAPITAL.

As little as a society can cease to consume, so little can it stop to produce. Regarded in its constant coherence and continuous flow of renewal, every social process of production is at the same time a process of reproduction and maintenance. The latter has as much a capitalistic form as the former.

The process of production is introduced with the purchase of the working power for a certain time, and this introduction constantly renews itself, whenever the term of purchase of labor has elapsed, and with it a certain period of production, week, month, etc., expired. The laborer is only paid *after* his working power has operated. It is a portion of the product created by himself, that constantly returns to him in the shape of wages.

Let us suppose a capitalist had originally been in possession of say $1,000, the source of which we will not investigate—which he now applies capitalistically, and in a manner which yields him a yearly sur-

plus value of $200, which he consumes; then, in the course of 5 years he will have consumed a sum, exactly corresponding to the capital originally advanced.

Whether the capitalist imagines he had only eaten the profit and simply preserved his original capital, and whether portions of this capital, f. i. buildings, machines etc still exist tangibly in their original form— all this does not matter. The capitalist has consumed the advanced capital *value* of $1000. Had he not replaced it by unpaid labor, his capital would have vanished or he would have become debtor for the same amount to a third person. In the case then capital has reproduced itself in 5 years. The capital value advanced, divided by the yearly consumed surplus value, gives the number of years or periods of reproduction, after the lapse of which the *originally advanced capital value has been consumed by the capitalist, and has therefore vanished.* May capital result from his own labor or from whatsoever originally, sooner or later, it converts itself into *embodiment of unpaid, foreign labor.*

The original postulates for the conversion of money into capital were not only the production and the circulation of commodities. On the commodity market the possessor of value or money and the possessor of the value creating substance, the possessor of the means of production and necessaries of life and the possessor of the workingpower had to meet as buyer and seller. This given basis of the capitalistic process of production is maintained by that same process. The laborer, therefore, constantly produces the real, concrete wealth as capital, a power foreign to him, ruling and exploiting him. The capitalist as constantly produces the workingpower as purely personal source of wealth, separated from its own means of embodiment and realisation, only existing in the personality of the laborer, in short, the *laborer as wages laborer.*

Even the individual consumption of the laborer is a part of the production and reproduction of capital, inasmuch as it preserves the workingpower, as for instance machines are preserved by lubrication, cleaning etc. Whatever the laborer *must* consume, in order to be able to work, he consumes to the advantage of the capitalist, just as the beast of burden feed to the advantage of their owners.

We see, that, from a social point of view, the workingclass is *also outside* of the immediate process of work as much an appurtenance of capital, as the dead working utensils. *The Roman slave was riveted by chains; the wages worker is bound by invisible threads to his owner.*

Formerly, when it so deemed necessary, *capital vindicated its "right of ownership" on the "free laborer" by compulsory laws.* So was, f i , the emigration of machinists from England prohibited by penalty of law until 1815. During the late civil war, when the English cotton-industry was completely prostrated, the laborers demanded national aid to facilitate their emigration. Then the cotton-lords went raving about madly and suggested to render the laborers "assistance," in consideration of certain kinds of labor, such as stone breaking etc., to keep them in starvation, but by no means facilitating their emigration. They acknowledged it pretty

plainly then, that the laborers were their milk-cows, which they must afterwards use again, since without them no surplus-making was imaginable. Nor did the capitalist-parliament misconceive its calling, and did, as the cotton-knights wished.

The capitalist process of production by its own operation reproduces the separation between working power and working means. It thereby reproduces and perpetuates the conditions for exploiting the laborer. It continually forces the laborer to sell his working power in order to live and continually enables the capitalist to purchase the same in order to enrich himself. It is no longer chance, by which the capitalist and laborer meet as purchaser and seller on the commodity market. It is the very trick of the process, that continually precipitates the one on the market as seller of his working power and incessantly converts his own product into the other means of purchasing In fact the laborer belongs to capital, before he has sold himself to the capitalist. His dependence is at once brought about and concealed by the periodical renewal of his self-sale, by the changing of his individual bosses and by the fluctuations of the market-price of labor. The capitalistic process of production considered as a whole or as a process of reproduction, does not only create commodities, not only surplus value; it creates and preserves the *capitalistic relations*; on the one side the capitalist, on the other side the wages laborer.

Hitherto, we have but considered how surplus value emanates from capital, let us now contemplate, how capital issues from surplus value.

Suppose a capital amounts to $10,000, which were to afford an annual surplus value of $2000 and these would—all other things equal—be again invested in production, then from these $2000, an annual surplus value of $400 will again accrue. We may leave it undecided, where the original $10,000 came from or we may suppose, that their owner (who is perhaps a modern Hercules) has created them with his own labor, nevertheless we know positively how the $2000 surplus value were produced; we know that they are *foreign, unpaid labor* converted into money. And now the $400! To create these, the capitalist has only advanced (risked?) that, which he had already notoriously appropriated from foreign labor. Therefore the more unpaid labor the capitalist appropriates, the more is he enabled to appropriate unpaid labor in future. In other words: The more impudently a capitalist fleeces laborers, the greater will his facilities for the exploitation of *more* laborers be. "Labor," says Wakefield, "creates capital, before capital employs labor."

We had first assumed, that the capitalist consumed the whole of the surplus value, then we postulated, that he converted all the surplus value into new capital. In reality, neither the one nor the other takes place *exclusively*, but surplus value is used in *both* ways.

The sum of the surplus value produced in a country, which *might* be converted into capital is always *greater*, than the sum that is *actually* converted into capital. The greater the development of capitalistic

production, the more surplus value is created, the greater will be the *luxury and extravagance of the capitalists.*

The capitalist has only in so far historical significance and a historical right to exist, in as much as he consumes as little surplus value as possible and capitalises as much as possible. In doing this, he compels *humanity* to produce for the sake of production and to create such conditions of production, as can only constitute the foundation of a higher form of society. However, competition alone forces the capitalist to continually expand his capital; and then the power of the capitalist grows with his increase of capital, so that the thirst for power unites with the greed for riches.

In the historical beginning of the capitalistic mode of production—and every capitalistic upstart individually experiences this historical phase—the desire for wealth and avarice predominate as absolute passions.

But the progress of capitalistic production creates not only a world of enjoyments; with the speculation and the credit system, it opens thousands of sources for sudden enrichment In a certain stage of development a conventional degree of extravagance, which is at the same time display of wealth and therefore a means of procuring credit, becomes a necessary business measure for the capitalist

Avarice, and inordinate desire for enjoyments, constitute the double soul in the capitalistic breast. The avarice, though, does not prompt the capitalist to the famous "abstention" from enjoyments, but rather to the greatest possible extent of exploitation of laborers, reduction of wages etc.

———o———

THE CAPITALISTIC LAW OF POPULATION.

Since, as we have seen, a part of the surplus value is constantly added to the capital, *i. e.* employed in the process of production, capital and with it the extent of production—is continually increasing, and so must that portion of capital, which purchases the workingpower; the wages fund, continually increases.

Considering then, that through the capitalistic production the capitalistic relations, the capitalist on the one side and the laborer on the other, are reproduced, it is evident, that with the reproduction of capital on a larger scale, on the one side *more or greater* capitalists and on the other side *more* wage laborers must arise. Sometimes, however, circumstances occur, as the opening of new markets, the arising of new branches of production etc., which increase the growth of capital in such a degree, that the supply of labor can not keep pace and then the wages rise, which is a source of great chagrin to the capitalists—but such exceptions do not alter the rule. (Even in such emergencies the capitalist does not wait until the laborers have increased by propagation

enough to cause a falling of the price of the workingpower. He complacently leaves it to theorists to suspect him of such angelic patience As a practical man he rather offers him a reward, who invents a machine, by which laborers can be *ousted*.)

It was demonstrated above, that the methods, which increase the fertility of labor, postulate a production on a continuously increasing scale, and it is self-evident, that the latter, presuming a society in which the means of production are private property, can only be extended to that degree, in which the means of production and the necessaries of life accumulate in the hands of individual capitalists.

The transition from artizanship and petty manufacture in general to capitalistic production could only be consummated, because *previous to the commencement* of the real capitalistic epoch of production a certain accumulation of capital in the hands of individual commodity-producers had already taken place We may call this the *original formation of capital; how* it was effected, will be shown further on.

Accumulation of capital is the prerequisite of the capitalistic mode of production and the latter again makes accummulation of capital possible. Now the individual capitalists are continually waging war against each other and their weapon is the cheapening of commodities. The greater a capital is, the more profitably can it be employed in production, and therefore the smaller capitalists must by and by succumb in the war of competition with the greater capitalists. The smaller capitals are absorbed by the greater and capital is more and more concentrated. the scale of production becomes greater and greater and the process of production is subjected to continual changes, all imaginable branches of production are gradually carried on capitalistically and the productivity is continually increased by all this.

On the other hand, simultaneously with the growth of capital, that fixed portion of it, which is invested in the means of production, *increases*, and the variable portion, which is invested in working power, *decreases*. The necessary consequence of this progressing change of the relation of quantity of its two components is, that in the same ratio in which the productive power of social labor gains and in which the working class increases the capital wealth, it also produces the means with which a constantly increasing number of its own members are made *superfluous, set free*, converted into so called *surplus population*.

As every separate historical mode of production has its *distinct* historical laws of population, so is this a law of population *peculiar* to the capitalistic mode of production. A final natural law of propagation exists but for plants and animals.

But as the accummulation of capital makes laborers superfluous these superfluous ones again become *instrumental* to the accumulation of capital. Since the great industry is in a state of incessant transformation, since it must often suddenly extend its field of operation and always must acquire new fields of operation, it must have an absolutely free, that is more or less unemployed mass of laborers at its disposal. Capital there-

fore does not only need operating laborers, but also an industrial reserve-army, which it can let loose on production and repulse at any moment and according to its requirements. Of course this reserve army does not always consist of the same laborers; *every* workingman, who is at times unemployed, belongs to it for the time of his enforced idleness. The whole form of movement of modern industry therefore arises out of that constant transformation of a part of the working population into unemployed or half-employed "hands." This specifically capitalistic law of population, or rather of surplus-population is the *condition of life* of the capitalistic mode of production.

We have seen, that the development of the capitalistic mode of production and of the productivity of labor – which is at once cause and result of the increase of capital – enables the capitalist, to extricate *more* labor with the *same* expenditure of variable capital by dint of the greater exploitation of the single workingpowers. We have also seen, that the capitalist gradually purchases *more* workingpowers with the same capital value, as in constantly growing proportion skilled laborers are replaced by unskilled, ripe by unripe, male by female, adults by juveniles This shows, that the setting free of laborers is a *more rapid* process, than alone results from the technical revolutions of the process of production, which are quickened by the progress of the extension of capital, and from the corresponding increase of the fixed (invested in the means of production) and decrease of the variable (invested in working power) portions of capital.

A portion of the laborers work *more* than the average length of time with more than the average expenditure of power, thereby *increasing* the number of surplus laborers and these compel the former (by competition) to overwork! This condition is a powerful means of enrichment of the individual capitalists and at the same time accelerates the creation of the industrial reserve-army in a measure corresponding to the progress of the social increase of capital

Upon the whole the general laws of the movement of wages are *exclusively* regulated by the entrance and exit of the industrial reserve army, which correspond to the periodical alternation of medium production overproduction, glut and crisis, medium production etc., changes, which with the progress of the great industry follow each other more and more rapidly and are again crossed by minor, irregular fluctuations.

The rising and falling of wages is therefore not determined by the movements of the *totality* of the working population, but by the changing relation with which the working class is divided into active and reserve armies, by the lesser or greater extent in which the surplus laborers are employed.

Modern industry would fare very badly, if demand and supply of labor were not regulated by the actual *desires of investment* of capital, but if reversely the movement of capital depended on the absolute number of people.

But this the professors of political economy imagine to be the case. According to their theory the increase of capital is followed by a rising of wages, which again causes such a great increase of the laboring population, that the increase of capital can not keep pace for any length of time, and consequently many laborers must remain unemployed, which results in a falling of wages. Reversely, they hold, that low wages will so reduce the laboring population, that demand for labor will supersede the supply, or that the decreasing wages and the simultaneous greater exploitation of working-power will accelerate the increase of capital, while the increase of the laboring population would be checked by the low wages Both cases will finally result in a rising of wages—until the consequences of this rise will again lead to their falling.

(This theory is *apparently* so clear, that Lassalle, f.i. was captured by it, and took occasion to recommend the substantial part of it with particular stress to the workingmen under the name of the "economical (or iron) law of wages".—

(Karl Marx, however, penetrated this able but false argumentation and he is indeed the first one, who has discovered and explained the specifically capitalistic law of population. *Never* has the misery among laborers (which is really bad enough in some districts and often lasts for decades) resulted in *such* a decrease of the laboring population that it occasioned a rising of wages Man can suffer incredibly before he perishes. Why, go in our miners' and weavers' districts and see, whether despite the most pitiable destitution, they have not mostly large families. In extraordinary cases alms will keep the poorest between living and dying. Just so will a scarcity of laborers not result in a rising of wages. Where laborers are scarce, an urgent desire is felt to *improve the means of production, new machines are invented etc., in short, the process of production will be so transformed, that the present laborers will be sufficient and partly be superfluous.* With such tedious things, as waiting until high wages will stimulate the laborers to a more rapid multiplication, and thereby in time create such a numerous working-population, that the wages must again fall—with such tedious things, capital will never bother itself If it is in want of more laborers, it will need them immediately and not in 10 or 20 years)

The number of employed laborers does not grow in the same ratio as capital, but rather in a constantly decreasing ratio, with the progress of modern industry. If the accumulation of capital on the one side increases the demand for labor, it will on the other side—by the impulse it imparts to the expansion and development of the capitalistic mode of production – increase the influx of "free" laborers and their pressure on the employed. The movement of the law of demand and supply *on this basis* completes the despotism of capital. As soon, therefore, as the laborers organize to struggle against this law, or to avert or weaken its consequences, capital becomes frenzied and raves about violation of the "eternal and holy law" of demand and supply, and makes *compulsory laws* as, f.i. the conspiracy-laws, laws against "breaking of contracts" etc.

THE VARIOUS FORMS OF CAPITALISTICAL INCREASE OF POPULATION.—PAUPERISM.

There are different modes of creating surplus laborers. In many industrial branches great masses of male laborers are employed only up to a certain age, after which but a small portion of these can remain in the same branch of business, whilst the greater number is thrown out. Part of these "superfluous," emigrate, that is, they follow the emigrating c pital. One of the consequences of this is, that the female population increases more rapidly than the male.

The seeming incongruity, that a scarcity and a redundancy of laborers can exist at the same time, is also explained by the peculiarities of the capitalistic mode of production. Firstly, capital requires a proportionately greater quantity of youths than of adult male laborers, secondly, the division of labor binds the laborer to certain business branches. In London, f i. in 1866 from 80,000 to 90 000 laborers were unemployed and at the same time complaints were made of a scarcity of "hands" in the factory districts.

In consequence of the rapid consumption of workingpower by capital, the laborer of a medium age has generally outlived his prime and falls into the ranks of the superfluous, or else he must be satisfied to exchange good work for poorer (illy-paid).

It is in the interest of capital, that the working generations release each other *rapidly*, so that, despite the early wearing out, a sufficient quantity of fresh working-power is always on hand. This is attained by early marriages, which are a necessary consequence of the conditions in which the industrial laborers live, and by the circumstance that the laborer's children can be exploited at an early age, can help to "earn", which is conducive to their begetting, or at least not inimical to it.

As soon as the capitalistic production seizes agriculture, the demand for farm laborers decreases in the same ratio in which the augmentation of capital increases The more the soil is tilled by machines, the fewer laborers will naturally be rexuired and here it is not like in factory industry, where the discharged laborers can at least partly find shelter in new enterprises, while the industrial agriculture constantly converts a larger portion of the soil into pasture. A portion of the farm laborers is therefore always on the way to factories and thus forms a constant sourse of increase of the *city* labor population.

This of course pre-supposes a constant, though *concealed redundancy of laborers* in the country, which is only perceptible in its whole extent when industry at times requires an unusual quantity of working-power. (The surplus population in the country and its constant flow to industry is as yet only very apparent in England, but must become just as evident *everywhere*, with the spreading of the capitalistic mode of production.)

The unemployed surplus population really constitutes a part of the active labor army, but is employed only very irregularly. Their stand-

ard of life falls *below* the average condition of the working-classes and just this circumstance makes them the broadest foundation of certain branches of exploitation for capital. The longest working-time and the lowest wages are found here. Where alluding to the so-called house-labor we have become acquainted with the main form of this species of laborers.

And it is just *this* element of the working-class, that multiplies the *quickest*. Peculiar as it is, it is nevertheless a fact, that those classes of laborers whose wages are the lowest, have the *largest* families. This reminds one of the profuse multiplication of weak and much persecuted species of animals.

The sediment of the surplus population constitutes the *total impoverishment, pauperism*. Aside of vagrants, criminals, prostitutes etc., we find here in the main three different species Firstly: *ablebodied*, i. e. such, who can only find work at times, but at other times live on foreign aid, who are mendicants. Secondly: *orphans and children of the poor*, true candidates for the industrial reserve army, who are in times of business prosperity drafted in masses for production. Thirdly: the *degenerated, indigent, disabled* etc. These are partly such which have foundered on the one-sidedness caused by the division of labor, partly such who outlive the normal age of a laborer, partly victims of industry whose number increases with dangerous machinery, mines, chemical factories, etc., f. i. the crippled, the ailing, widows etc.

The creation or the perpetuation of these miserable people is included in the creation of the surplus population and with the latter it constitutes a condition of existence of the capitalistic production and of the development of wealth. But capital always finds means to shift the trouble of sustaining these people, impoverished by its exploitation, on the shoulders of the working-people.

In discussing the production of the surplus value, it was shown, that all methods of increasing the social productiveness of labor in capitalistic form, are developed at the expense of the individu l laborer: that all means of enriching production will revert to means of ruling and exploiting the producer, the laborer; that they cripple the latter into one-sidedness, degrade him to a dependant of the machine, annihilate with the pain the intrinsic worth of labor, estrange him to the mental powers of the process of work in the same ratio in which the latter enlists science as a productive power; that they make the conditions in which he works more and more irregular, subject him to petty malignant despotism, during his work transform his time of life into time of labor and precipitate his wife and child into the jaws of capital. But all methods for the production of surplus value are at the same time methods for the accumulation of capital and all accumulation of capital reversely becomes the means of developing those methods.

It follows then, that in the same degree as capital grows, the condition of the laborer, whatever his pay may amount to (consequently also if an improvement takes place *apparently*), will *grow worse*. The

law finally, which keeps the industrial reserve army in a constant equilibrium with the extent and energy of the augmentation of capital, chains the laborer firmer to capital, than the pins of Vulcan fastened Prometheus to the rock. It requires an increase of *misery* corresponding to the increase of capital. The augmentation of capital on the one side, therefore, is at the same time an augmentation of misery, pain of toil, slavery, ignorance, brutalization and moral degradation on the other side i. e. on the side of *that* class, which creates its own product in the shape of capital.

(We regret, that the limited space of a pamphlet, designed to be widely spread, does not permit the repetition of the many valuable statistical and other items of Marx's work; but it will not be hard for any laborer to observe with his own eyes, how the wealth of his oppressors increases and how at the same time the laborers sink deeper and deeper in servitude, misery and destitution.)

———o———

THE ORIGIN OF MODERN CAPITAL.

We have seen how money was converted into capital, how capital is made through surplus value, and again surplus value through capital. However, the formation of capital pre-supposed the surplus value, the surplus value pre-supposes the capitalistic mode of production, and the pre-requisite for the latter is the presence of large amounts of capital in the hands of commodity-producers. The whole process seems to rest on a formation of capital, which is *not* the result of the capitalistic mode of production, but its starting point: an *original accumulation of capital.*

Our bourgeois-economists generally take it very easy. They simply declare, that so and so many years ago there were a number of industrious people, who grew rich by hard labor, while the rest of the people were lazy and soon became a prey to extreme misery and therefore possessed nothing but their working-power, which they finally had to sell, to maintain themselves, and thus they arrived at a state of dependence. And now these relations were simply handed down to us. Every thing pertaining to economic evolution was to have taken place in peaceful serenity while in history, as we all know, conquest, subjugation, assassination, in short, force, is decisive.

The pre-requisites of the capitalistic mode of production, are known to the reader. We know, that on the one side must be the posessor of the means of production and on the other side the possessors of working-power, who are free to dispose of their own. We know furthermore, that the posessors of working-power must not only be free inasmuch, that they are nobody's bodily property, but must also be free from all the necessaries of life, as they would otherwise not be compelled to sell their working-power voluntarily. Finally we know how these relations

are maintained. The *creation* of the same can be nothing else than the separation of the laborer from the means of production. This operation therefore constitutes the "original" formation of capital. It comprises a whole series of historical processes, and moreover a double series, first, a dissolution of relations, which made the laborer the property of third persons, and then dissolution of the right of property of the immediate producers, to their means of work

This separating process comprises the whole history of evolution of the modern civic society; which would at once explain the matter, had the historians not confined themselves to describe the emancipation of the laborer from serfdom, but had they also related the transformation of the feudal mode of exploitation into the modern. The starting point of this development was the *slavery of the laborer;* its continuation consisted in a *change of the form of this slavery.*

Although the capitalistic mode of production had a transitory existence in the countries bordering on the Mediterranean as early as the 14th and 15th centuries, its era properly dates from the 16th century. Wherever it flourishes, the manumittance has long been accomplished, and the mediaeval cities already are in a state of decay.

Those moments, in which great masses of people are *suddenly* and *forcibly* separated from their means of subsistence and production and are thrown on the labor market as outcast proletarians, those moments are remarkable epochs in the history of the dissolving process. The forcible destruction of the landed property of the laborers is the basis of the whole process. This was done in various forms in the different countries. We shall take England for an example, because this process was there carried on most ostensibly.

In England, serfdom had disappeared towards the end of the 14th century The greatest portion of the inhabitants were occupied with agricultural pursuits; they were mostly peasants who did their own farming and but a small number of wage-workers, which, however received a few acres for their own use and had their share of the commons. The peasants were at this time only subjects of the feudal lords.

Towards the end of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th century, when the monarchy attained absolute power, it decreed the abolition of the feudal retinues, by which a great many people were thrown on the labor-market. But this was only a small prelude of the revolution. The feudal lords created a much greater proletariat by soon thereafter chasing the peasants from their soil and by annexing or rather *stealing* the commons at pleasure.

The rising of the wool manufacture in the Netherlands at that time caused a rise of the prices of wool, which led the feudal lords to convert immense tracts of agricultural lands into pastures. Untold numbers of peasant-dwellings decayed or were torn down, but sheep-breeding flourished!

Thus, the working-class was, without transition, precipitated from the golden into the iron age. Legislation was frightened at the conse-

squences of this revolution, but the antidotes which it employed were as ineffectual as they were inappropriate.

During the Reformation, church property was also stolen and its vassals driven away. i. e. cast into the proletariat. With William III of Orange, the capital-makers also came to power, which was inaugurated by carrying on the robbery of *state-dominions*—which before had been but pilfered—on an immense scale. Finally they went so far as to accord the *commons by legislation* to the pillaging landlords; i. e. the lords, who framed these laws, presented themselves with the property of the people!——

The place of independent peasants was now occupied by some few large and many small, dependent and servile farmers. The systematic land thefts created immense estates for the landlords, while at the same time it "set free" the rural population as proletariat for the industry, set it free the quicker, the more decisively the transformation of farming on a small scale to farming on a large scale kept pace with the land robberies. "Thinning out" they called driving off the rural population in troops. In the 18th century the so driven off people were even prohibited from emigration, in order to force them into the iron grasp of industry.

Thus the robbery of church property (although this had originally also been acquired by fraud and swindle), the fraudulent acquisition of state-domains, the theft of commons and the conversion of the feudal into modern state property, combined with driving away of the rural population, these are all highly noble methods of *original capital-formation.* By these the field was acquired for capitalistic farming, the soil was embodied into capital and the urban industry supplied with the requisite outlawed proletariat.

Those who, by the abolition of the feudal retinues and by the land robberies, were driven from the soil,—an outlawed proletariat—could not possibly find occupation in the nascent manufacture as rapidly, as it arose. On the other hand those who were so suddenly precipitated from their wonted mode of living, could not accustom themselves to the discipline of their new condition with the same suddenness. Numbers of them became beggars, robbers, vagrants etc.—During the latter part of the 15th and the whole of the 16th century, *a bloody code against vagrancy reigned in all Western Europe.* Those driven from their soil were *branded, flogged, tortured, enslaved, even executed,* under the accusation of "shunning work" etc. But the land-robbers were honorable people.

It is not enough, that in the conditions of work appears on the one side, capital, on the other appear men, who have naught to sell but their working-power. Nor is it enough, that they are compelled to sell themselves "voluntarily." With the progress of capitalistic production a working-class develops, which from its birth becomes accustomed to its relations of dependence, the organization of capital breaks all resistance and the continual creation of surplus laborers keeps the wages in the lowest possible stage. Thus the rule of capital over the laborer is pre-

served by the "natural laws" of capitalistic production. Not so in its *infancy*. The nascent bourgeosie needs and uses the *state-power* to "regulate" *wages*, i. e. to fix them as low as possible, to *prolong* the *working-day* and to keep the laborer in subjection This is also a main feature of the so called *original formation of capital.*

In the 14th and 15th centuries, the wages laborers were not yet very numerous and the social distance between them and their bosses was not great. But the legislation on wages labor was always hostile to the laborers and designed for their exploitation.

We have before mentioned the forcible prolongation of the working-day, and now need only observe, that the wages were, in the forepart of capitalistic production, also "regulated" by law. The highest wages were determined, and who ever would give or take *more* was subject to a heavy penalty, *less* could be taken and given at pleasure. Labor-unions in England were, from the 14th century until 1825, treated as *crimes!*

After having contemplated the violent creation of outlawed proletarians, the sanguinary discipline which converted them into wages-laborers, the filthy actions of the state, which by *police-regulations* enhanced the augmentation of capital with the degree of exploitation, the question arises: *Where do the capitalists originally come from?* For the land robbery directly only created large land-owners.

The farmers, who took the place of the peasants, were mostly poor and penniless fellows to whom the landlords advanced seed, cattle and agricultural implements for which they had to return a certain portion of the yield. As soon as the farmer (by dint of exploiting wages-laborers and by the use the of common pastures robbed by the landlords) was able to raise sufficient funds, then the original mode of payment by division of the product was displaced by rent stipulated by contract. A variety of favorable circumstances enabled this new kind of farmers to gradually enrich themselves; f. i. the leases for 99 years which were still customary in the 16 century, the simultaneous depreciation of the precious metals, connected therewith the increase in the prices of agricultural products and the depression of wages etc. etc. Finally, the great industry, supplies capitalistic agriculture with machines, gives it a firm foundation and effects its complete separation from the industry. One part of the farmers become "capitalistic farmers" another proletarians.

The original of the *industrial* capitalist was less gradual. Undoubtedly many a small guild-master, independent artizan or wages-laborer became a small capitalist. The petty capitalists fleeced the laborers vigorously, thus augmenting their capital and finally became capitalists in the true sense of the word. In the infancy of the capitalistic production there was much room for change, like in the infancy of the mediaeval town settlements where the question: who of the runaway serfs shall be master and who servant? was mostly decided by the earlier or later date of their flight. However, the slow process of this method was entirely inadequate to the commercial requirements of the new world-

market, which the discoveries towards the end of the 15th century had created. But the mediaeval ages had handed down two different forms of capital, which existed in almost *every* society historically known to us: *the usurer's and the merchant's capital.*

The *money-capital*, acquired by usuring and trading or rather by all manners of swindling, was prevented from being converted into industrial capital by the feudal constitution in the country and by the guild constitution in cities. These impediments were cleared away by the abolition of the feudal retinues, by the land-robberies and partial driving away of the rural people and by the decay of the guild-cities. In ports of export and in rural districts, where the guilds were powerless, manufactures were now established.

The discovery of gold and silver lands in America, the extermination and enslavement of the natives there, the conquering and pillaging of East India, the transformation of Africa into hunting grounds on black skins signify the advent of the era of capitalistic production. These noble proceedings, aided greatly the original *formation of capital.* In their wake came the commercial wars of the European nations with the globe for its theater. The methods of original formation of capital are distributed more or less in a historical succession over Spain, Portugal, Holland, France and England. In England towards the end of the 17th century, they are systematically combined in *Colonial-system, State-debt-system, Modern Tax-system* and *Protective-system.* They are partly based on the most brutal force, as the colonial-system; but all employ the *state-power*, the centralized and organized power of society, to accelerate the transformation of the feudal into the capitalistic mode of production, and to shorten the transitions. Force is the accoucheur of every old society, which is pregnant with a new one.

The colonial system developed commerce and navigation and procured markets for the incipient manufactures as well as high prices for their merchandise. The treasure, which outside of Europe was gained by open pillage, enslavement and murder, flowed to the mother-country and was here converted into capital.

With the state-debts a system of international credit arose, which often conceals the source of original capital-formation of a certain country. The baseness of the Venetian system of robbery f i , constitutes an occult foundation of the capital—wealth in Holland to which country the decaying Venice loaned heavy sums of money. It is the same between Holland and England in the 18th century and at present between England and the United States.

Many a capital, that to day appears without certificate of birth in the United States, has but yesterday been ground out of children's bones in England.

The protective system (a system of favoritism) was an artificial means of manufacturing manufacturers, expropriating independent laborers, of capitalising the national means of production and necessaries of life and of forcibly shortening the transition from the old fashioned into

the modern mode of production. On the European continent the original capital of the manufacturers was even partly derived *directly from the state treasury*. "Why," exclaims Mirabeau, "go so far to search for the causes of the splendor of Saxony's manufacture prior to the Seven-years-war? 180 *millions state-debt!*"

The colonial-system, state-debts, oppressive taxation, protection, commercial wars etc., these scions of the real manufactural period, assume gigantic proportions during the infancy of the great industry. The birth of the latter is celebrated by the colossal Herodian children robbery. The children of the poor-houses and orphan's-houses were bartered away to manufacturers in flocks and half killed by overwork by day and night, half starved. With the development of the capitalistic mode of production, all sense of shame of public opinion was lost Everything was praised, if it resulted in augmenting capital; even the infamous negro-trade.

Simultaneously with the introduction of children-slavery in Europe, negro-slavery in the United States was made severer, because the rising of the English Cotton-factories necessitated the increase of cotton production.

To effect the separation of the laborer from the means of labor, to convert on the one side the social means of production and necessaries of life into capital, and on the other side the bulk of the people into property-less wages-slaves ("free workingmen"), is the product of modern history.

If *money*, after Augier "is born with a liveblood-stain on one cheek," so is capital from *top* to *toe perspiring gore and dirt from every pore*.

Where then, does the original capital-making lead to? So far as it is not the immediate conversion of slaves and serfs into wages-laborers, therefore, but a *change of forms*, it means only the *dissolution of that private property resulting from ones own labor*.

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS.

The laborers private ownership of his means of production is the foundation of the petty-manufacture, the necessary condition for the development of social production and of the free individuality of the laborer. After a while, however, petty-manufacture becomes a fetter to the development of production which it caused; it must give way to the great industry. The latter cannot make use of scattered means of production, but requires their concentration and consequently effects the same. The dwarfish property of many is united in the hands of a few and that with the most unscrupulous application of every forcible means.

When this process of transformation has attained a certain degree, a new fashion of robbing the private owners begins, which is effected by the very laws of the capitalistic production. One capitalist kills off

many others. The *many* petty capitalists are superseded by a constantly decreasing number of *large* capitalists.

At the same time the sum of misery, oppression, subjugation, degradation and exploitation grows, but *also the spirit of rebellion* in the always swelling working-class, trained, united and organized by the very mechanism of the capitalistic mode of production.

The privileges of capital now become fetters to the mode of production which has risen with them and through them. The concentration of the means of production and the socialization of labor arrive at a point where they become incompatible with their capitalistic frame.

It will be burst. The death-knell of the capitalistic private property is sounded. The appropriators of strange property will be expropriated.

Thus the individual property will be *re-instated*, but on the basis of the acquisitions of the modern mode of production. *There will arise an amalgamation of free labor, which will collectively own the earth and the means of production created by labor.*

The conversion of the scattered property into the capitalistic was a slow process, because it was the seizure of the property of the masses by a powerful few; The conversion of the capitalistic property into the socialistic (common) property will be more rapid, because this only means the removal of the powerful few (iron-kings, cotton-knights land- and factory-lords etc.,) by the people at large.—

WORKINGMEN OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

ERRATA.

p 5. 10th line from above ; read *buried.*
5. 5th " below ; perquisites, read prerequisites.
7. 15th " " incumberance, read incumbrance.
9 10th " " read *no.*
11. 8th " " use, read me.
16. 19th " above ; perquisites, read prerequisites.
18. 8th " " turbrue, read turbine.
18. 10th " " pulley, read pulleys.
18. 13th " " are only there to, read are only to.
18. 4th " below ; machine, read mechanism.
20. 3d " above ; sleep they give, them, read sleep, they [give them.
27. 2d & 3d " " Faults finding, read Fault-finding.
29. 5th " " capitalist, read capitalistic.
29. 14th " " other, read other's
29. 17 & 18 " below ; never, the less, read nevertheless.
30. 12th " " increases, read increase.
34. 15th " " rexuired, read required.
35. 4th " above ; Where, read When.
36. 25th " below ; presupposed, read presupposes
37. 17th " " which, read who.
38. 1st " above ; -squences, read -quences.
39. 10th " below ; original, read origin.
39. 5th " " change, read chance.